

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/631,168	07/31/2003	Bradley Kropp	85820.639	7538
. 30589	7590 04/21/2006		EXAMINER	
DUNLAP, CODDING & ROGERS P.C.			LANKFORD JR, LEON B	
	PO BOX 16370 OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73113		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,	·	1651	
			DATE MAILED: 04/21/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/631,168	KROPP ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
•	Leon Lankford	1651
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the application to become ABANDON	DN. timely filed m the mailing date of this communication. IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status	·	
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 Ja 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, p	•
Disposition of Claims		
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,6,7,10,13,24,25,44 and 45</u> is/are pe 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,6,7,10,13,24,25,44 and 45</u> is/are rej 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. S ion is required if the drawing(s) is c	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applica rity documents have been recei u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ation No ved in this National Stage
Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	

Application/Control Number: 10/631,168

Art Unit: 1651

Applicant's arguments that the previous response was in fact responsive are convincing.

Page 2

The previous rejections under 112 and 102 have been overcome by applicant's amendments and arguments. The rejections under 103 remain as the prior art suggests the use of the claimed SIS to prepare a graft by seeding a variety of cells thereon.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 6-7, 10, 13, 24-25 & 44-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is unclear what applicant is claiming in that the claims are drawn to a graft which is SIS seeding with bone marrow stromal cells but wherein the stromal cells have differentiated into smooth muscle cells thus it is unclear if applicant is claiming the stromal cells or the muscle cells.

Application/Control Number: 10/631,168

Art Unit: 1651

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 6-7, 10, 13, 24-25 & 44-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Badylak et al (as cited above) and in view of Zhang et al (*Pediatrics Journal 1999 & Journal of Urology* 2000).

Badylak et al (Col 6) teach seeding cells, including stem cells, on intestinal submucosa thus creating a graft (as is claimed). The reference discusses that stem cells can be proliferated, expanded and/or differentiated on the graft. The claims contain the limitations "mucosal surface" and "serosal surface" which only have the effect of saying that the submucosa has a top layer and a bottom layer, which clearly the submucosa of

Application/Control Number: 10/631,168

Art Unit: 1651

Badylak must have. Badylak calls the surfaces, the luminal and abluminal surfaces and explains that the cells an be seeded on either side (Col 4). Badylak doesn't call the seeded material "A urinary tract tissue graft" however the elements of the claim are the same as those taught by the references. The specific tissue used for the graft is taught to be from the small intestine of a pig by the method of the incorporated 4902508 and is taught to be clamped on a frame to create a flat surface. The reference anticipates the claim subject matter.

Badylak does not disclose using their tissue graft for the repair of the urinary tract, however as the patent does disclose that the seeded submucosa is a tissue graft and because Zhang et al (*Pediatrics Journal* 1999 & *Journal of Urology* 2000) teaches using a cell-seeded SIS for the repair of urinary tract tissue it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to use of the graft of Badylak as a graft for urinary tract tissue with a reasonable expectation that repair would be facilitated.

Accordingly, the claimed invention was prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leon Lankford whose telephone number is 571-272-0917. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu 7:30-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike Wityshyn can be reached on 571-272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Leon B Hankford Jr

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1851